

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figures 9(a) and 9(b). This sheet replaces the original sheet.

Remarks/Arguments:

The figures have been objected to. In response, Figs. 9(a) and 9(b) have been amended to include the legend --Prior Art--. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The brief description of the drawings was objected to. The brief description of the drawings has been appropriately amended.

Claims 1, 4 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Yamazaki (U.S. 6,776,847). The rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants' claims are patentable over the prior art for the reasons set forth below.

The Official Action argues that Applicants' Fig. 9(b) shows all of the features of the claimed invention except for Applicants' protrusion. In the present invention, the protrusion prevents deposition material from falling onto the top surface of the substrate. Protrusion 5, for example, is shown in Applicants' Fig. 3(b).

The Official Action argues that Yamazaki shows a protrusion. Thus, the Official Action wants to add Yamazaki's protrusion into Applicants' Fig. 9(b) in order to obtain Applicants' claimed invention. The logic set forth in the Official Action is flawed.

Yamazaki, Fig. 15, shows a protrusion on both sides of substrate 1501 on page 6, last line of the Official Action, the Official Action argues:

It would be obvious to keep the height of the protrusion greater than the substrate height to control any deposition products from depositing on the back side of the substrate during cleaning operation.

There are several flaws with the argument set forth in the Official Action:

1) Fig. 15 of Yamazaki shows a substrate within film formation chamber 1503. Film formation chamber 1503, however, is attached to the top surface of the protrusions. Thus, on the far left and far right of Yamazaki's film formation chamber 1503, the deposition material can not flow onto the back side of the substrate. Thus, in Yamazaki, it does not matter whether his protrusions are the same height of the substrate, or higher than the substrate. The deposition material can not flow onto the back side of the substrate because it is totally blocked by the protrusions.

2) Yamazaki shows an evaporation mask 1502a below his substrate 1501. One of ordinary skill in the art understands that an evaporation mask includes holes. Furthermore, there is a space between Yamazakis' protrusion and Yamazakis' substrate. Thus, deposition material is able to flow around substrate 1501 and onto the back side of substrate 1501. Yamazaki thus has the same problem that Applicants identified in their prior art Fig. 9(b). Yamazakis' protrusions do not prevent deposition material from reaching the back side of substrate 1501.

3) The Official Action argues that a protrusion would "control any deposition products from depositing on the back side of the substrate." However, the source of the conclusion set forth in the Official Action is the present application. Thus, the Official Action is using "hindsight" in order to reject Applicants' claims. A rejection based on hindsight is impermissible.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine Yamazaki with Applicants' admitted prior art in order to obtain Applicants' claimed invention. Yamazaki suffers from the same problems set forth with regard to Applicants' Fig. 9(b). One of ordinary skill in the art would not rely on prior art which has the same flaws as Applicants' admitted prior art in order to solve the problem identified by Applicants.

This application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/nm

Attachments: Figures 9(a) and 9(b) (1 sheet)
Exhibit (**DO NOT ENTER**)

Dated: December 31, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700